

DCDP HUMAN SERVICES DIVISION GRANT APPLICATION REVIEW PROCESS
HSAC Evaluation Tool for Year 2005 and 2006 Applications

Agency Name: _____

Program Name: _____ Currently Funded __ New __

Funding Priorities: 1) Emergency Services and Homeless Services _____
 2) Youth Services _____
 3) Realignment and Innovation _____
 4) Disabilities _____

Please note the strengths and weaknesses of the proposal.

Rank the following questions: 1-strongly disagree 2-disagree 3-neutral 4-agree 5-strongly agree

Program Service Delivery	Total Points	Awarded Points
1. Program description clearly documents service need of the target population.	5	
2. The program fills a gap in services to a specific population.	5	
3. The agency has experience in providing same or similar services.	5	
4. The agency demonstrates past success in meeting program outcomes.	5	
5. The program offers collaborative/partnership opportunity with other providers of services.	5	
Total	25	
Goals and Objectives	Total Points	Awarded Points
1. The proposal clearly states realistic performance outcomes and provides explanations for how these will be measured.	5	
2. The proposal contains evidence to support program design as an effective means of addressing the identified issue (i.e. research, experience, community feedback).	5	
3. Reporting/measuring systems are described, including data collection to adequately monitor outcomes.	5	
4. The proposal contains a realistic time frame for service delivery.	5	
5. Consumers are involved in the quality and improvement of outcomes.	5	
Total	25	

DCDP HUMAN SERVICES DIVISION GRANT APPLICATION REVIEW PROCESS
HSAC Evaluation Tool for Year 2005 and 2006 Applications

Budget		Total Points	Awarded Points
1.	The program demonstrates an appropriate and acceptable cost per client.	5	
2.	The budget is reasonable given the scope of the project.	5	
3.	All program expenses are eligible.	5	
4.	Budget pages are complete and correct.	5	
5.	The program leverages City funds and services with other resources.	5	
6.	The overhead cost ratio is reasonable (15% or less).	5	
Total		30	
Rater's Opinion		Total Points	Awarded Points
1.	The City should fund this applicant.	10	
Based on the rater's overall opinion of the proposal, award points based on a scale of 1 – 10. The proposal: 1 pt - Is unacceptable 3 pts- Is not a solid proposal 5 pts- Is an average proposal, but could be improved 7 pts- Is a good proposal 10 pts- Is very strong.			
TOTAL SCORE		90	